

242

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-10509-2023 (O&M)

Date of Decision:28.04.2023

RAJIV CHOPRA

..... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present : Mr. K.P.Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Priyanka Sadar, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Vivek Goyal, Advocate
for the complainant.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

CRM-9719-2023

Allowed as prayed for.

CRM-M-10509-2023

1. On 09.03.2023, the following order was passed:

“The petitioner through instant petition is seeking quashing of FIR No.401 dated 15.09.2020 registered at Police Station Kurukshetra University Kurukshetra , under Sections 406 and 498-A IPC. Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that the police, in the compliant of private respondent, conducted investigation and in its report dated 04.07.2020 (Annexure P-2), did not find any case of dowry or harassment on the part of the petitioner. The police under pressure of the complainant registered FIR against the petitioner and

accordingly presented challan. There were allegations against father, mother, elder brother and his wife, however, police presented challan only against the petitioner i.e. husband of the complainant. The Protection Officer vide its report dated 14.09.2020 (Annexure P-3) did not find any offence. The petitioner has made fixed deposit of Rs.27 lakhs in the name of the private respondent.

Notice of motion.

Mr.A.S.Virk, Advocate has filed his power of attorney on behalf of the complainant, which is taken on record.

Learned counsel for the parties submit that there are possibility of amicable settlement.

Let the matter be referred to the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court and the parties are directed to appear before the Mediator on 21.03.2023.

Adjourned to 28.04.2023.

The petitioner is directed to pay Rs.50,000/- to the private respondent towards litigation expenses.

The trial court is requested to adjourn the case beyond the date fixed before this Court.”

2. Learned counsel for the parties are *ad idem* that matter between the parties stands settled before Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court. The parties are going to file petition under Section 13B of Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 seeking divorce by mutual consent.

3. Learned counsel for the complainant submitted that he has no objection if the impugned FIR, in view of compromise arrived at between the parties, is quashed, however he submits that in case

petitioner does not make the payment in terms of compromise, he may be granted liberty to move an appropriate application, seeking recalling of this order.

4. FIR No. 401 dated 15.09.2020 (Annexure P-1) under Sections 406 and 498A of IPC, registered at Police Station Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed qua the petitioner(s).
5. The complainant is at liberty to move an appropriate application, if petitioner fails to comply with terms and conditions of compromise deed.
6. Pending application, if any, shall stand disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)

JUDGE

28.04.2023

Ali

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>